

## FAX To Ernst Zündel

Robert Faurisson

18 January 1992

Dear Ernst,

Thank you for your fax about the possibility of laying false news charges against Sabina Citron and her bunch because of what she says on "Wannsee".

My advice is that we, as academics, could show with excellent arguments that "Wannsee" had nothing to do with "a meeting by high ranking nazi government officials [making] a decision [] to murder every Jewish man, woman and child in Europe." Even academics who are on the side of Sabina Citron know that and said it (Jäckel and C°) and, if "Wannsee" had been the place of such a decision, Hilberg and C° would not say that there was in fact no decision for the "murder" of the Jews. And there would not be any discussion between the "intentionalist" theory and the "functionalist" theory : the first ones would say : "We are right because, on January 20, 1942, at Wannsee, the "intention" of murder was clearly present." In fact, in "Wannsee", there was an interministerial meeting (with no high ranking nazi government officials except Heydrich) where Heydrich said that from now on "emigration is to be replaced by the *evacuation* of the Jews to the East." Mind you : those 14 words are those of the staff evidence analysis (SEA) by J. Lester on 29 september 1949 (Doc. NG-2586). Heydrich's words were : "Die Evakuierung der Juden nach dem Osten" (p. 3 of the document). At the famous "Stuttgart Kongress" (3-5 May 1984), this version of "Wannsee" was implicitly accepted by the "historians" defending the "Holocaust".

But what may be clear for specialists might not be clear at all for members of a jury. And remember that what you would have to demonstrate is that S. Citron is publishing something that she *knows* is false. Remember article 181 (ex 177) of the Canadian Criminal Code : "Every one who wilfully publishes a statement, tale or news that he *knows* is false []." Remember also the following words : "and that causes or is likely to cause injury or mischief to a public interest []." All this means that you would have to convince 11 or 12 simple people of Canada :

1. that "Wannsee" did not decide the murder of the European Jews (and implicitly that nothing else decided a murder which did not exist) ;
2. that S. Citron wilfully published something that she knew was false about "Wannsee" ;
3. that, by so doing, she caused or was likely to cause injury or mischief to a public interest of the Canadian people.

It would be easy, for the defense lawyer of Sabina Citron, to show that this lady believed what everyone in Canada believes about the "murder" of the Jews and that she is entitled to ignore that some academics have changed their mind about "Wannsee" in the 80's (especially) and, even if she had been spreading or publishing something which she knew was false, what kind of public interest suffered from that ? Of course, a few individuals in Canada and especially Ernst Zündel are suffering because of this lie but this is not the public at large. Remember that you would have to define this "public interest". The law requires that specification.

Imagine the consequences if your cause was lost. It would come down in the medias all over the world that "Wannsee" was correctly described as the meeting where the Nazis had taken the decision of murdering those poor Jews. By saying that, the medias would be wrong but, as you know, they would say so.

=====  
18 January 1992

First displayed on aaargh: 2 April 2001.

---

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <[\[email protected\]](#)>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA..

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in thoses places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

---

[\[email protected\]](#)

| [Accueil général](#) | [Homepage English](#) | [Faurisson Archive](#) | [Archive Faurisson](#) |

You downloaded this document from <<http://aaargh-international.org/engl/FaurisArch/RF920118.html>>